



Larry Hogan
Governor

Michael J. Frenz
Executive Director

Members

Thomas E. Kelso
Chairman

Leonard J. Attman
Joseph C. Bryce
Gary L. Mangum
Carolyn Mozell
Manervia W. Riddick
Jodi C. Stanalonis

Capital Projects
Development
Group

Gary McGuigan
Executive Vice President

Eric Johnson
Senior Vice President

Al Tyler
Vice President

Maryland Stadium Authority
The Warehouse at Camden Yards
351 W. Camden Street, Suite 300
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-223-4150
1-877-MDSTADIUM
Fax: 410-333-1888

cpdginfo@mdstad.com
www.mdstad.com

Voice: 800-201-7165
TTY: 800-735-2258

Addendum No. 6

To Offerors:

**Request for Proposals
Architectural/Engineering Services
Redevelopment of the Pimlico Racing and
Laurel Park Racing Facilities**

Date Issued:

September 14, 2020

This addendum is hereby made part of the Request for Proposals dated July 30, 2020, as amended, on the subject work as though originally included therein. The following amendments, additions, and/or corrections shall govern this solicitation.

This addendum incorporates the following items:

1. A copy of the Questions and Answers Part II, is attached hereto. An additional Q&A document will be issued later this week.

Note: All addenda must be acknowledged by the Offeror in the Technical Proposal.

Yamillette Waite
Procurement Officer

End of Addendum 6

Request for Proposals

Architectural/Engineering Services Redevelopment of the Pimlico Racing and Laurel Park Racing Facilities Questions & Answers: Part II

Action Item

	Question	Answer
1.	Will the design team be responsible for obtaining approvals from historic preservation review boards, as applicable for each project?	The A/E team will be responsible for assisting with the historic preservation review board submissions as part of the Programming and Due Diligence effort.
2.	MDE will be reviewing Stormwater Management and Sediment & Erosion Control since MSA is the contracting entity, correct?	MDE will be responsible for Stormwater Management and Sediment and Erosion Control review.
3.	Will the road and utility plans be reviewed by Anne Arundel County and the City of Baltimore?	Roadwork and utilities will be designed to the requirements of the state/local jurisdiction having appropriate authority over the specific area. The requirements at the Pimlico Racing Facility and the Laurel Park Racing facility may vary based upon their jurisdictions.
4.	If design consultants form a partnership between firms for design and documentation/ administration (execution) of the project, are both firms required to submit their respective qualifications?	Yes.

5.	How many prime firms are responding beyond those in yesterday's virtual meeting?	Please refer to Addendum No. 5 for information about all of the AE primes that participated in the networking sessions.
6.	Could you please provide the bidder/planholder list of the project Redevelopment of the Pimlico Racing and Laurel Park Racing Facilities?	Please refer Addendum No. 5.
7.	Scope of Work – Laurel: Does MSA/MJC/Stronach already have approvals for demolition, modification or renovation of historic areas/components or will the design team be responsible for obtaining approvals from historic preservation review boards, as applicable for each project?	Review Board submission/approval has not been performed. The A/E team will be responsible for assisting with historic review board submissions for each facility as part of the Programming and Due Diligence effort.
8.	Experience & Qualifications: Where the design and documentation of the scope may be split between multiple consultants – such as Architecture, MEP, Civil – are we to provide the requested SF330 information for every consultant including specialty consultants such as site survey, utility detection, wetland delineation, etc.?	Yes.
9.	Work Plan/Attachment F: The requested staffing plan (Attachment F) will be tied directly to our financial proposal. With this in mind, will MSA consider either simplifying this requirement	The completed Attachment F submitted with the Technical Proposal can be limited to show the expected level of effort for the identified key personnel during the early design effort (Programming and Due Diligence, Facility Condition Assessment and Study Design Phases).

	<p>or instead having this attachment be submitted with Financial proposals from shortlisted firms?</p> <p>Otherwise, we anticipate that this will take a significant amount of advance coordination and negotiation with consultants, as it relates to fee development.</p>	<p>MSA will require the resubmission of a detailed Attachment F, inclusive of all staffing and phases, from those firms short-listed to provide a Financial Proposal.</p>
10.	<p>MBE Participation Goals/Sub-goals: The overall scope of the projects are not directly proportional to the anticipated budget/fees for sub-consultants and specialty consultants for each project. Will MSA consider lowering the MBE participation threshold or perhaps apply the current participation goals to sub-contracted dollars only? This would allow for A/E teams to provide the best combination of specialized expertise with enhanced opportunities for mentoring MBE and WBE firms.</p>	<p>The overall MBE goal and subgoals were established by the MSA's Procurement Review Group. The scope of work, available number of MBE firms and other items were taken into consideration before establishing the goals, to ensure that the goals are reasonable and achievable.</p>
11.	<p>Sub-contracting: Per COMAR, is it legal for prime consultants/offerors to engage proposed sub-consultants in exclusive arrangements - i.e., preventing sub-consultants from joining other teams?</p>	<p>Please refer to Q&A Part I, included in Addendum No. 4. MSA cannot provide legal or business advice.</p>
12.	<p>Will the selected team be required to provide a Demolition and Hazardous materials scope?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

13.	Will the selected team be required to provide a Geotechnical scope?	Yes.
14.	Will the selected team be required to provide a Cost Estimating scope?	The A/E does not have primary responsibility for cost estimating services. Per the RFP, the selected team will be required to work in conjunction with MSA's Cost Estimating Consultant in order to produce a reasonable and reliable estimate of the expected Construction Cost and the overall project budget.
15.	Is surveying to be done by MSA, or is it expected to be provided by the selected team?	The selected A/E team is responsible for providing surveying services.
16.	Do we need an Economic Benefits consultant in Section 4.3.F.5 to assess the Economic Benefits factor?	MSA is not requiring an Economic Benefits Consultant.
17.	Will the new roads and utilities be designed per Baltimore City DOT and DPW standards?	See response to Question No. 3.
18.	Will public utility service connections be required for each potential development parcel?	This will be determined during the programming effort.
19.	Will subdivision/ development plan approval be required for the new building parcels?	No.
20.	Who will maintain control of the development parcels, Stronach/MSA?	This information is not relevant for responding to the RFP.

21.	Will the selected team be required to obtain city agency /UDAAP reviews and approvals?	The selected team will be responsible for working with the respective local authorities/agencies during the review process. The agencies/authorities may vary for the two facilities.
22.	Will the selected team be required to obtain a Storm Water Management Plan from DPW?	See response to Question No. 2.
23.	Will the selected team be required to address traffic mitigation and forest conservation?	Yes.
24.	Has a Phase I EA been done?	Performing a complete hazmat assessment is required under the RFP.
25.	What provisions have been made in the RFP to ensure the new facility meets NFPA & IFC Fire Codes for Public Safety Communications Coverage?	The successful Offeror must meet all local, state and federal code requirements. Please refer to the Sample Contract.
26.	Page 23, Section 3.3 – could you clarify the extent of the scope of work that is intended to be included for the Archaeological Study?	Maryland Historical Trust outlines the Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland. Please reference the MHT Website: https://mht.maryland.gov/research_survey_section.shtml
27.	How many days of racing will be held at Pimlico? Do they bracket the Preakness and Blackeyed Susan Weekend?	The number of annual racing days held at Pimlico has not yet been determined, however, the total racing days will be limited and consolidated to specific period of time around Preakness. All Preakness events including the Preakness and Black-Eyed Susan races will occur at Pimlico during construction.

28.	<p>What is the total attendance for the Preakness weekend?</p> <p>a) Grandstand/Event Center? b) Apron? c) Infield?</p>	<p>The needs for the redeveloped Pimlico Racing Facility will be determined as part of the programming effort.</p>
29.	<p>How many onsite parking spaces are required for the Preakness and Blackeyed Susan? a) Number Surface Parking Spaces anticipated? b) Number of Garage Parking Spaces anticipated?</p>	<p>Parking needs will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
30.	<p>What are the stable requirements for Pimlico?</p>	<p>Stabling needs at Pimlico will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
31.	<p>Does the current estimate for the project include off site transportation mitigation impacts? a) Road improvements, site access mitigation, signalization changes etc.? b) Has there been any traffic studies conducted as part of the initial planning? c) What scope of work should be assumed for Transportation Access? Will a comprehensive Traffic study including off site impacts, be required in the scope of work for the project?</p>	<p>A comprehensive traffic study, inclusive of offsite impacts will be required for both facilities.</p> <p>Any on site impacts identified during the study process would be included within the project budget. The cost of addressing off site impacts identified during the study process is not included within the project budget.</p>
32.	<p>Please describe the design review and approval process for both the Laurel and Pimlico sites. Will Pimlico include the Baltimore City "Urban Design and Architecture Advisory Panel"</p>	<p>To be determined.</p>

	(UDAAP) process for the Pimlico site?	
33.	What is the Designer's responsibility for estimating during each phase of the project?	The A/E firm will work with MSA's cost estimating consultant. Please refer to question #14.
34.	At what point in the design process will The CM be brought on board to the project? a) Please clarify the CM's responsibility for cost control and budgeting during each phase of the project?	It is anticipated that the CM would be brought on board in advance of the Design Development Phase of the project.
35.	Does the current estimate for the project include budgets for on-site utilities and off site utility impact improvements? a) Stormwater? b) Power upgrades? c) Gas? d) Water service demand?	Yes.
36.	The RFP suggests preparing the EIS as part of the design process. Has the MSA initiated any EIS activities? Will the MSA have its own consultant handling the processing of the EIS with the Authorities having Jurisdiction? Will the MSA expedite the EIS review process? a) What about an Economic Analysis? b) Environmental Studies? c) Does the MSA intend to file a separate EIS for each site?	The selected A/E team will be responsible for completing EIS activities as part of the scope of services under this RFP. MSA has not initiated these services.

37.	Has any Geotechnical work or Phase 1 Environmental work been completed for either site?	The selected A/E team will be responsible for completing geotechnical services/environmental assessments as part of the scope of services under this RFP.
38.	Does the MSA have an Economics consultant under engagement for this project?	No.
39.	There has been indication of a market study for the project by Crossroads? Is that study available?	Completed studies can be accessed at https://www.mdstad.com/studies/pimlico-race-course-study-phase-1-2
40.	Is there adequate Economic information to support the filing of an EIS for this project? Does the RFP require the consultant to have an Economic consultant on their team?	To be determined by the Offeror. Reference the RFP for specific scope of work.
41.	Is there existing data on the consumer/fan base for these sites? Were any consumer/fan surveys conducted as part of the pre RFP process?	This is not relevant for responding to the RFP.
42.	Are there any consultants currently engaged to reposition the sites from a branding/marketing/outreach perspective?	This is not relevant for responding to the RFP.
43.	Is there a community outreach, PR and marketing program planned to gather information and ultimately	MSA anticipates community group involvement and input during the planning and design phase of the

	gain endorsement from the community to embrace the redevelopment of the venue as well as the additional collateral development shown in the studies? i.e. additional retail, office, and residential density to the site(s)?	project. It is expected that the A/E team will be part of this process.
44.	What are the measurements for success as it relates to the development of a solution for this challenge? – Highest and best use for the site with the integration of new, state-of-the-art racing facilities? – Creating a destination for the immediate surrounding neighborhood? Primary trade area? And/or – Is this intended to reach a larger audience than “just” the northwestern community beyond the city but inside the beltway? – Has a market assessment / demand analysis been done for either site that would illustrate consumer demand for retail, entertainment, housing, and office uses? – Has anyone evaluated the competitive set for the development in regard to housing, retail, office, etc.?	This information is not relevant for responding to the RFP.
45.	The RFP suggests starting the planning and design process in November of 2020. Is there any consideration on what the overall schedule should be for the project? a) What is the targeted completion/reopening timeline for the Pimlico	Within work plan submissions for each facility, MSA is seeking anticipated durations for the completion design services (not-inclusive of CA Phase Services). The overall project schedule inclusive of required sequencing and required operational coordination efforts between the facilities will be finalized during the programming and due diligence phase.

	<p>facilities? b) Can Laurel Park be used for the Preakness to expedite the construction of Pimlico? c) Will the MSA advance detailed design and planning of either facility without final approval of the EIS for either facility?</p>	
46.	<p>What is the proposed schedule of racing to be held at Laurel? Number of days, number of months?</p>	<p>Reference 11-511(b)(2) of Senate Bill 987.</p>
47.	<p>What is the current total attendance? a) Average weekday? b) Average Weekend? c) How many racing festival weekends per year? d) What is the average attendance for racing festivals?</p>	<p>This information is not relevant for responding to the RFP.</p>
48.	<p>What is the projected total attendance post renovation? a) Average weekday? b) Average Weekend? c) How many racing festival weekends per year? d) What is the average attendance for racing festivals?</p>	<p>This will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
49.	<p>How many on-site parking spaces are required for Laurel?</p>	<p>This will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
50.	<p>Is a parking garage required at Laurel or is their adequate surface area for parking available?</p>	<p>Parking needs will be determined during the programming effort.</p>

51.	<p>The Studies indicate that Laurel Park will have year-round racing? a) Will winter racing be conducted? If so what months? Will an All Weather/Synthetic racecourse be required? Would this replace the existing dirt racing surface or will there need to be an additional allweather racecourse provided? b) Will there be night racing at Laurel Park? If so which course(s) would be required for lighting?</p>	<p>This will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
52.	<p>Is preservation of the existing Saddling paddock required? Is it functional as a saddling paddock or will a new year-round saddling paddock be required?</p>	<p>This will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
53.	<p>Are there specific concerns for the racing surfaces that must be addressed in the project? a) Is the size of the turf course adequate for the proposed changes in the racing calendar? Does it need to be wider? b) Do the racing surfaces require new technology? – Irrigation? – Timing devices? – Drainage? – Inner and outer safety rails? – Distance markers – Video towers?</p>	<p>This will be determined during the programming effort.</p>
54.	<p>How many horses will require stabling at Laurel year-round?</p>	<p>This will be determined during the programming effort.</p>

55.	<p>Will the current tent stabling facilities remain or are they scheduled for replacement?</p> <p>a) Are the existing Stalls, Tack Rooms, Wash Racks, and other interior equipment/finishes of the existing tent stable structures capable of being reused if the tents are replaced? b) Are any backstretch stable facilities to be retained? If so which ones?</p>	This will be determined during the programming effort.
56.	<p>What are the proposed on-site housing requirements for backstretch workers at Laurel? a) How many workers will be housed on site? b) Will there 2 people per room or will they be singles? c) Will there be a new backstretch food service operation? d) Will there be indoor and outdoor and recreational facilities required? e) Will there be a Chapel?</p>	This will be determined during the programming effort.
57.	<p>In the current project budget how much of the existing grandstand has been considered for renovation? How much for demolition?</p>	This will be determined during the programming and due diligence effort.
58.	<p>Please confirm per section 4.3.e.1.iv - Section F Example Projects - that you would like to see 5 (five) example projects per discipline as stated in 4.3.e.1.iii - for a total of potentially between</p>	Confirmed.

	60-80 separate representative projects.	
59.	If we are submitting two MEP firms, one prime and one MBE to partner, will we need to show 5 representative projects from each firm or a combined 60-80 total projects?	Confirmed.
60.	For Attachment F, Staffing Plan: Do we need to represent every resume included in Section E in the SF330 on the Attachment F staffing plan or just key roles? Can you please confirm which roles you would like to see represented on the Attachment F Staffing Plan?	See response to Question No. 8
61.	Please confirm if you would like to see two separate project teams, including project leadership for the Pimlico and Laurel project sites? Will you accept the same team for both sites?	This is at the discretion of the Offeror.
62.	Per Attachment L: Which sub-consultant team members will be required to complete the Capacity Summary Sheet?	The attachment must include all proposed subconsultants.
63.	Per section 4.3. Technical Proposal / I) Work Samples (Tab 6) - Please confirm whether you would like full	A hyperlink to electronic documents would be acceptable.

	document samples or if a hyperlink to electronic documents will be acceptable	
64.	In the response to the Request for Proposals, there are several requests for a Solicitation Number in the documentation but there is not one clearly stated. Can you please provide a solicitation number that should be used in our proposal submissions?	Please use the RFP title.
65.	Will the Xanadu gaming tenant remain in the Laurel facility post renovation?	Potential gaming tenant space requirements will be determined during the programming effort.
66.	Has anything changed in the dynamic of the race track and the neighborhood since the situational analysis was completed in February 2017 that the designers should be aware of?	This question is unclear.
67.	Is Baltimore City DPW planning any systemic upgrades to the water distribution system in the surrounding neighborhoods that will influence the extent of water system upgrades for Pimlico?	Reference City of Baltimore DPW records.
68.	What process for community input will guide the development of the perimeter trail and amenities? Is the design	To be determined.

	team free to suggest plazas, green spaces, public art and pedestrian promenade designs?	
69.	What accommodations for site security are being considered? Fencing inside of the 30 ft. buffer? Check points? Access gate?	Final site security needs for both facilities will be determined during the programming effort.
70.	Will this site redevelopment be exempt from Forest Conservation requirements?	No.
71.	What provisions, or systems are envisioned for the treatment of equine waste? Is there a pretreatment agreement in place with the City? Is there a nutrient recovery plan?	This will be determined during the Programming phase.
72.	Are there any floodplain modifications pending with FEMA? Specifically, is there a "Letter of Map Revision" (LOMR) pending?	MSA has no direct knowledge of this at this time.
73.	What is the status of redevelopment plans being proposed by the Stronach Group and how will this design team interact with these plans?	This question is unclear.
74.	Have mixed use land use initiatives for the Laurel Park Site been filed by the owner in the ongoing GDP Land	This is not relevant to responding to the RFP.

	Use Change Request input process?	
75.	LEED Certification. The RFP does not address “Green” requirements or any level of sustainable design beyond the IGCC. Will the project be required to be LEED certified?	While it is expected that the project will be designed to a set of minimum standards, as of this time the project is not seeking a LEED Certification.
76.	Will there be more guidelines for the oral presentation as we won’t have much time to prepare?	Instructions regarding oral presentations will be forwarded to short-listed firms. It is anticipated that short-listed firms will have approximately 45 minutes each to conduct an oral presentation, and 15 minutes for questions and answers. Short-listed Offerors will be asked to submit electronic copies of any presentation materials.
77.	In the SF330 form, should we include 5 projects total for the team and then upload separate volumes for the additional disciplines?	Each file must not be larger than 10gb.
78.	Should the 5 projects that we include in our SF330 be a combination of the team’s experience or just the Primes?	The prime and its consultants are each required to provide separate project examples. Project examples may cross-over, however, the descriptions should be clear to indicate the scope of services/value of work performed by the respective party for which the project is being submitted.
79.	Clause 4.3(i) (Work Samples (Tab 6)) of the RFP requires that the Prime Offeror provide a Work sample Facility Condition Assessment, Concept Design, Design Development with evidence of reconciliation with CM/A/E estimate, and	MSA would prefer to review complete project samples if eligible to submit without violation confidentiality clauses. In the event that this is not possible, please clearly identify within the technical submission and provide summary information. In the event that MSA requests access to view complete documents at a later date, the Offeror will be responsible for coordinating required access.

	<p>95% Construction Documents with evidence of reconciliation with CM/A/E estimate from one of the Prime Offeror's example projects. How is 'Work Sample' defined? The information requested is typically governed by confidentiality and intellectual property provisions within the contracts for the example projects (similar to the wording in the confidentiality clauses set forth in the Sample Contract set forth in Attachment G of the RFP). Providing this information may conflict with those confidentiality clauses. To avoid potential breach of confidentiality (and to avoid putting the MSA at risk of being a recipient of confidential and proprietary information), will the MSA consider summary information or other non-confidential information to suffice as the work samples to fill the request?</p>	
80.	<p>Is there a limit to the size of files to be uploaded? Is there a limit to the total number of files that can be uploaded per firm?</p>	<p>There is no limit to the number of file that can be uploaded. Please refer to Addendum No. 4 (item #2) and to question no. 77.</p>
81.	<p>Please clarify the scope of work around historic preservation in working with the Historic Preservation</p>	<p>See response to Question No. 7.</p>

	<p>Trust as referenced in the pre-proposal presentation.</p> <p>Will the project need to go through Maryland Historic Trust (MHT) approvals?</p>	
82.	<p>Executive Summary –Can you please clarify if by “two-(2) pages” you mean two-(2) 8.5” x 11”surfaces or two-(2) physical pages equaling a total of four-(4) 8.5” x 11” surfaces?</p>	<p>Two (2) 8.5”x11”surfaces.</p>
83.	<p>Can you provide a layman's summary of the key elements of Senate Bill 987 as they relate to the project?</p>	<p>No.</p>
84.	<p>Please clarify the event planning scope. Does it include event programming?</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the redeveloped facilities will host large event gatherings (i.e. Preakness activities/ Maryland Millions) that will require extensive overlay coordination. The design team will need to include an event specialist who can assist in identifying and coordinating the design for the overlay needs.</p>
85.	<p>In the interest of brevity, would you consider lists of relevant projects from subconsultants in lieu of full project sheets?</p>	<p>No</p>
86.	<p>The Work Samples requirement is impractical for an RFP submission, particularly with other relevant work typically confidential and subject to</p>	<p>No</p>

	client copyright. Would you consider removing this requirement or accepting abridged samples?	
87.	Is the requested Staffing Plan (Attachment F) requiring estimated person hours limited to the roles identified in the RFP?	No
88.	Can MBE/WBE participation percentage by phase vary as long as the overall MBE/WBE participation for the project meets the 33% goal and sub goals? i.e., different phases may have more participation than others?	Yes.
89.	Are there existing drawings covering all disciplines available for the Laurel Site to assist in the condition assessment report that can be provided to the awarded team?	MSA will provide documents in its possession relevant to this item of work to the successful Offeror after award.
90.	Do the sites currently have an owner or utility owned electric distribution system that feeds all the site buildings?	To be determined during the due diligence phase.
91.	Do the sites currently have a natural gas distribution	To be determined during the due diligence phase.

	system that feeds all the site buildings?	
92.	Is the intent to award the CM prior to design completion and involve them in the latter planning stages of design? The RFP states contract work in fall 2020.	See response to Question No. 34.
93.	The RFP does not stipulate specific "Green" Guidelines beyond approved Maryland Standards, does the MSA intend to integrate any renewable energy generation into the project, i.e. solar?	To be determined during the project design phase.
94.	Does MSA have an anticipated date/year for completion of construction on both projects?	To be determined during the project design and pre-construction phase.
95.	Does MSA Plan to phase the construction of buildings on site over multiple years?	To be determined during the project design and pre-construction phase.
96.	Does MSA plan to construct the Laurel and Pimlico sites in concert?	To be determined during the project design and pre-construction phase.

97.	Will the same CM be awarded both the Laurel and Pimlico Project Sites?	CM services for The Laurel Park Racing Facility and Pimlico Racing Facility may be awarded to either a single firm or two separate firms.
-----	--	---